

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	_ 1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/821,588		04/09/2004	William K. Leonard	55476US041	1883	
32692	7590	11/30/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
		PROPERTIES CO	EDWARDS, LA	EDWARDS, LAURA ESTELLE		
	PO BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427				PAPER NUMBER	
•				1734		

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/821,588	LEONARD ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laura Edwards	1734	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addre	ess
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION 136(a). In no event, however, may a solution of the second will expire SIX (6) MONION te, cause the application to become Alexandre of the second s	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this comm BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 s 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under 	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matt	• •	nerits is
Disposition of Claims	,, .,	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	awn from consideration. or election requirement.		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accompliant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and the option of the option of the correct and the option of the o	cepted or b) objected to e drawing(s) be held in abeyar ction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in A prity documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Sta	age
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date —.	Paper No(s	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-15 	52)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Cheatham (US 2,053601).

Cheatham teaches a smoothing station for improving uniformity of a wet coating on a substrate having a direction of travel or motion comprising (a) two or more reciprocating pick and place devices (15-20) that rotate in the direction of travel or motion (see pg. 4, lines 3-9 and lines 21-29) or (b) four or more reciprocating pick and place devices (15-20) that rotate counter to the direction of motion (see pg. 4, lines 3-9 and lines 21-29), the peripheral surfaces of the

devices (a) or (b) being at different positions along the substrate (pg. 4, lines 41-51). Even though Cheatham is silent concerning the pick and place devices contacting and recontacting the substrate while smoothing so as to effect different lengths of contact along the coating to improve uniformity, it would have been inherent or in the alternative obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the Cheatham smoothing station would enable variations in lengths of contacting and recontacting along the substrate because the smoothing rollers (i.e., pick or place devices) can be driven at different speeds relative to the speed of travel of the web as evidenced by pg 4, lines 22-30. One skilled in the art would recognize and appreciate that different lengths of contacting/recontacting of the coated substrate would be effected via variation in speed of rotation of the smoothing rollers and/or variation in speed of travel of the web or substrate.

With respect to the contacting periods improving uniformity along the longitudinal direction of the travel of the web, the Cheatham device inherently enables uniformity along the direction of travel of the coated web as evidenced by pg. 4, lines 37-41.

With respect to the number of smoothing rollers used, see pg. 3, lines 18-22.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall (GB1278099).

Hall teaches an apparatus for improving longitudinal uniformity of a liquid coating on a substrate comprising the combination of at least two or more pick-and-place devices (3; col. 1, lines 41-46) that rotationally move counter to the direction of travel of the substrate, the pick and place devices periodically contacting the coating and re-contact said coating along lengths of

Application/Control Number: 10/821,588 Page 4

Art Unit: 1734

the substrate, the pick and place travel at different positions including the direction of travel of the substrate (see Fig. 3) or the axial direction (see Fig. 4) wherein the pick-and-place devices are out of phase with one another (see claim 5) constituting non-periodically related devices. Even though Hall does not explicitly teach different lengths or distances along which the pick-and-devices contact and recontact the coating on the substrate, one of ordinary skill in the art would expect that the contacting distances or lengths would be different because the devices are translated or moved out of phase with one another such that the devices are not periodically related along the direction of travel of the substrate. Moreover, the apparatus of Hall can be adjusted such that the amplitude and frequency of the reciprocating motion of the smoothing rollers (i.e., pick and place devices) can be varied widely with a reduced amplitude and an increased frequency (see col. 3, lines 19-34) such that a variety of lengths of contacting/recontacting of the coating can result along the coated substrate.

With respect to claim 3 and 4, Hall recognizes two or even five pick-and-place devices being (see col. 1, lines 41-46). In addition, all the pick-and-place devices can be moved out of phase with one another such that the devices are not periodically related as evidenced by col. 1, lines 80-89.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura Edwards whose telephone number is (571) 272-1227. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

Application/Control Number: 10/821,588 Page 5

Art Unit: 1734

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Fiorilla can be reached on (571) 272-1187. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Laura Edwards Primary Examiner Art Unit 1734

Le November 26, 2005